EXHIBIT B

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PINAL

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

-vs
FERNANDO SEGOVIANO ALMANZA,

Defendant.

) 2 CA-CR 2014-0034

No. CR201103026

)

Defendant.

Florence, Arizona October 1, 2013 8:46 a.m.

BEFORE: The Honorable Boyd T. Johnson, Judge of the Superior Court

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD

JURY TRIAL, DAY 2

(Opening Statements)

(COPY)

PREPARED FOR:

Arizona Attorney General Criminal Appeals Section

REPORTED BY:

Jacquelyn A. Allen, RPR

AZ Certified Reporter No. 50151

1	INDEX	
2		Danie
3		Page
4	State's Opening Statement	4
5	Defendant's Opening Statement	19
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	APPEARANCES	
2	On Behalf of the State:	
3	PINAL COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE By: Matthew Long, Deputy County Attorney	
4	Bureau Chief Major Offenders Bureau Thomas Kohler, Deputy County Attorney P. O. Box 887	
5		
6	Florence, Arizona 85132	
7	On Behalf of the Defendant:	
8		
9	COOPER & RUETER, L.L.P. By: Paul Green	
10	P. O. Box 15005 Casa Grande, Arizona 85130-5005	
11	ALSO PRESENT:	
12		
13	Detective Randy Snyder, Plaintiff's Case Agent Patrick Cote, Defense Investigator Laura Anderson, Court Interpreter	
14	Sabine Michael, Court Interpreter	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
İ		

Florence, Arizona September 30, 2013 8:48 a.m.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(Proceedings occurred prior to opening statements which were reported and previously transcribed. The following proceedings were held in open court with the presence of the jury and Laura Anderson, court interpreter.)

STATE'S OPENING STATEMENT

MR. LONG: The Defendant's a hunter, but not a regular hunter. Oh, he's a poacher. A poacher who already had his prey selected. What he searched for, this poacher, was the right time, place, and manner where he could snatch up his prey. His prey was 4-year-old Ada, and the day he chose was October 22nd, 2011, when he lured 4-year-old Ada to a hidden, isolated place where he forced his finger into her vagina.

He picked this hidden place so that if she ever told, it would be his word against the word of a child. He controlled everything so that she wouldn't believe, be believed, and so he could get away. But there's one thing he couldn't control. He couldn't control Ada's body and the truth that it would tell when he scratched the inside of her vulva with his finger.

And now the Defendant's going to ask you to ignore that medical evidence, to ignore the truth that her body tells, and to believe that she made it up or was convinced to lie about what happened. At the end of this trial, ladies and gentlemen, your verdict will decide which one that is.

This poacher was able to select his prey, was able to find that little girl because he had access to her. And he had access to her because he worked on a ranch, a ranch near Dudleyville, and this is the Double Check Ranch, a cattle ranch that puts food on our community's table.

And Ada's mother, Kathryn Quinn, worked on this ranch as head butcher and as the manager of the packing house, and as a result of that job, she was given a home on this property. And she spent most of her time, hours and hours a day, working in this building right here, the cutting house, where she worked as a butcher cutting up the animals and grinding meat and doing what's necessary to provide food on our community's table.

And the Defendant was a ranch hand. Worked fixing fences and doing various things. Kind of a part-time employee. But as a result of his work there, trusted to work, trusted to do the job as an employee,

б

he was also trusted to be around Kathryn Quinn's family, which includes Ada, her older brother, Jack, and her younger brother, Arlo. And the Defendant did have access to these kids.

In fact, these kids, who loved to work on the ranch, liked to play there. They had a yard and a swing set, but they also had access to the animals. They had chores, and one of those chores included taking care of some pigs that Ada's mom had. And the pigs were back here, kind of tucked back behind the ranch.

And the Defendant also helped out with those pigs at times, so he knew the lay of the land and he knew what this setup was. And he knew that those kids, Ada, had one pig in particular -- she loved Tinker Bell, a larger black pig -- and that she liked to go feed the pigs, liked to help her brother feed the pigs, water the pigs. Although she was too young to really do anything about it or to help out with the chores, she liked to be around them.

And the Defendant, put it this away, having already selected his prey, realizing that this would be a good place to strike -- the pig area is very isolated with these mesquite trees, and you can see some of the views that if you're looking towards there, how hidden and isolated it would be. This poacher, able to set

this trap, isolated his prey from her family and those that protect.

So he looked for the day and the time. And that day came on October 22nd, 2011, when he convinced Ada to go over to the pigs, to look at the pigs. And she did. She was wearing a flowered pink dress, or pink, green, and white dress, and that's what she was playing in that day. Maybe it was the dress; maybe it was something else. The Defendant decided this is the day I can strike.

So he convinces Ada to leave the protection of her home and that front yard, knowing that her mother would be busy for hours in that cutting house working away. He would only need to contend to isolate her from her older brother, Jack, because Jack was there with the pigs as well. It was his job to take care of the pigs, although the Defendant would help him at times lift things, water the pigs, do other things. But Jack was there.

And this is the path that they'd take in order to get to the pigpen area. They'd walk through this corral area, across some fences, have to navigate through this corral, and would come to this gate here. And that's how these kids, and Jack in particular, would go when he'd take the food with his little wagon, 50

pounds or 25 pounds of food, to head over to the pigs, to open that gate, and then stand a good distance, many, many, many yards until you got to the pigpens. And this is a view inside the gate of those pens, the location, the place where this man snatched up his prey.

But Jack was there. And the Defendant convinces him, you know, go get some treats for the kids. He knows where those are, and those were on the other side of the house or over where the house and the packing area was. So Jack, willing to do that, not thinking anything about it, not -- him having already, that is, the Defendant, gained the trust of this family, of Jack and Ada, as a worker.

Jack goes and he gets the treats, and that's the opportunity. The Defendant controlled things, a small window, knowing Jack would be back, knowing Jack was just there, knowing that if Ada told, no one would believe that he did this because Jack was there or nearby. Crafty like a fox.

But that gave the opportunity he needed for Jack to walk back through that area, through the corral, through those gates, to find the treats for the pigs, to come back. And in that moment, the Defendant took that opportunity and finally completed his hunt by pulling down her underwear and forcing his finger into her

vagina.

At some point Jack comes back and the Defendant stops. And Ada's now left there alone, isolated, confused as to what happened. And the Defendant, like a fox in a henhouse, disappears, because around that time was the end of his shift. And he's gone, convinced that if Ada tells, it will be his word against the word of a child.

And these are the mesquite trees, the isolation and cover, and this is the trap that was set and the place where Ada was attacked and the place where the Defendant left his mark, both emotionally and physically.

Ada goes back with her brother, again processing what happened, not -- as a 4-year-old, not understanding what this means, but tells her brother something. And her brother tells her, You need to tell mom. And eventually she does.

She goes into mom while she's working, distracted, doing her job, and she says something, talking about the Defendant's fingernails and how sharp they are. Mom's confused, asks her to clarify. And she demonstrates what he did, talking about how he scratched her. Police are called, an investigation begins.

But how do you investigate, how do you

prove something that happened when the person planned it to get away, leaving no evidence? Well, as with a fox in a henhouse, sometimes the best evidence is the evidence left behind by that fox, feathers, claw marks. The Defendant left his own claw mark on this little girl.

Ada to the police. Police are called, and they start an investigation. While she's waiting to be talked to, while Ada's waiting, she has to go to the bathroom. Mom takes her to the bathroom. Ada talks about that it burns when she pees. And that's when mom discovers that the Defendant left his mark. And Ada's body told the truth, the same truth that she told: Fernando stuck his finger in me and he scratched me.

They find blood on Ada's underwear. But these officers, these investigators, don't just say, Well, that's it, we're done. They look, and they think, Well, what else could have caused this injury? And they look at the underwear. And there's something significant, not about what's there, but about what's not there.

And what they see is that there's no rips or tears. I mean, after all, this is a little girl who walks around a ranch that has fencing and barbed-wire,

but they observe that without any damage to the underwear, no rips, tears, the injury bypassed that underwear. It bypassed it exactly how Ada said it did, the Defendant pulled her underwear down and stuck his finger in her.

With this information, Ada is taken to a medical exam. Now, she's injured. She needs to be treated. And they go to the Tucson Medical Center and speak to Dr. Klein. As part of the diagnosis and as part of treatment, they talk to Ada. And Ada tells them -- that is, Dr. Klein -- Fernando asked me if I wanted to go check the pigs with him. When we went to check the pigs, he pulled my panties down and he was kissing me. He put his fingers inside me, and his fingernails are so sharp that they scratched me. Very clear, very precise, a sensory experience.

Dr. Klein observes her most sensitive areas and sees a superficial abrasion. An abrasion. Not a cut, not a tear, not a laceration, an abrasion. And it's at the base of the left labia minora or inside the vulva. Dr. Klein, who doesn't have the same training to deal with kids and victims of sexual abuse, sends her to a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner, Sharon Welch.

Sharon Welch also speaks to Ada as a treating medical personnel and gets some information.

And Ada very candidly tells the woman that Fernando stuck his fingers and his nails in me where I go pee from. He told me to get on his lap, he pulled my panties down, then he put his fingers inside me. He kissed me on the side of my check. He touched my butt, too. Same concepts, same description, but different words. The words of a child relating what she experienced.

Nurse Welch also examines her and takes some photos as well that are called colposcope pictures, and you'll hear about those. And that -- it's a medical -- it's a medical instrument that takes pictures, in this case of victims of sexual abuse and the genital area. And she takes those pictures. But she observes an injury, observes an abrasion.

Now, Dr. Klein and Nurse Welch offer an opinion based on this, based on their observations, and they say this is consistent with a finger, and it's exactly what you would expect given what this little girl said. Her body is telling the truth that her mouth already spoke, and these two medical professionals confirm it.

These doctors offer other opinions and tell these detectives. But could it have been caused by something else? What about barbed-wire? They say, This

is not a barbed-wire injury. There was no other injuries on her, her underwear wasn't damaged, and this is an abrasion, this isn't a cut. There's no bruising or anything else outside of -- on the outside of her body or the outside of her vulva. This is a friction injury consistent with a finger.

With this information the detectives go and get the Defendant's story. They contact him and they speak with him. And you'll have an opportunity to hear about that interview. You'll hear that Mr. -- the Defendant, although a Spanish speaker and that's his primary language, speaks English, understands English and speaks English.

And as the detectives speak with him, he answers them. He responds in English. And they ask him about what happened the day before. And at times they do use a Spanish interpreter, and we're not saying he's the best English speaker, but he certainly understood, based on his answers.

And Detective Snyder speaks with him, knowing that this information is there, knowing that Ada's body spoke the truth and revealed the truth that Ada told. And he confronts him and says, You know what? Tell me about what happened yesterday.

And the Defendant says, Nothing. Nothing

1 happened. 2 They ask him who he knows, and he says, I 3 know Pablo, known as Paul. He's the owner. 4 He says he doesn't know the little girl's 5 name when he's asked about the little girl, but acknowledges there was a little girl. But then he 6 changes a little bit and says, You know, I did see the 7 8 little girl over by the pigs. Focuses in on where he saw her, acknowledging he was alone with her, just as 9 10 Ada said. 11 And he's asked, Well, did you ever touch 12 her? 13 He said, No, I never touched her. 14 put my hands on her. 15 Detective pushes him a little bit and says, Not sure that I believe you. She says you touched her. 16 17 Well, I may have. I may have. I may have 18 touched her, I may have picked her up. 19 He says, Oh. Continues on and pushes him. 20 And the detectives do something. They tell -- they give a ruse and tell the Defendant, Well, 21 22 you know, your DNA, your skin was found on her. It wasn't, and it wasn't expected to be, because the 23 24 officers, when they take him in and they speak to him, they look at his hands and they notice that they're 25

clean. Having worked on the farm earlier that day -- or I'm sorry -- early the day before, he washed his hands a number of times.

And you can see this from the videos that these aren't the hands of somebody who just got done working on fences and working with pigs. And they see that and they know that obtaining DNA is going to be very, very unlikely given his -- the fact that he washed his hands. But they tell him anyway, you know, Your DNA is on her. Your skin cells are on her.

And that's when he changes his story. And he says, Well, I might have picked her up. I might have put her on my lap. Telling a little truth, because Ada said, He put me on his lap. He doesn't know that, but he confirms what Ada said.

And then pushed a little more, the Defendant says, Well, I might have kissed her on the cheek -- exactly as Ada said -- but that's it. No other touching, nothing else.

They ask him if he might have slipped or put his finger up in near her vagina, and he says, Absolutely not. And then he changes a little bit and says, All right, I might have touched her butt. I might have picked her up and cupped her butt. But that's it, nothing more. Again, exactly as Ada said, He touched my

butt, too. And the Defendant, with his own words, confirms it, but ultimately denies putting his finger in her, despite the truth that her body revealed.

Although his hands had been washed, the detective's attempt to get scrapings from his nails and take his fingernails to see if Ada's DNA -- the skin had been somehow on his hands, knowing that the way DNA works, how volatile it is, especially skin cells, that that was unlikely since he had washed his hands. But they take it, as good investigators do. And as expected, Ada's skin cells aren't on his hands, given the fact that he's already washed them.

But this isn't the last statement that the Defendant makes. The Defendant meets a man named John Boggs. And John Boggs is in jail, and he's in jail for a domestic problem he had with his wife. And John Boggs speaks Spanish and is in the same pod, the same area as the Defendant, and he helps the Defendant. And he helps him because he believes him. He believes he was wrongly accused and he's in there and he shouldn't be. And so he helps him write letters, helps him do some writing, talks to him in Spanish.

But then he's surprised when the Defendant finally tells him, I don't understand why they're charging me with having sex with her. All I did is put

my finger in her to about the first knuckle.

That's when John Boggs steps back and says, I'm going to tell what he said, because you don't do this to kids.

He tells John other things, that he would -- wanted to date Ada's mom, that Ada's mom kind of rebuffed him, turned him down, but repeatedly says that he puts his finger just to the knuckle. Says that he's worried about DNA, worried about that coming back, even though he washed his hands. Admits to John that he washed his hands and he's worried about that, but he's still confused. Why are they charging me with having sex with her when all I did was put my finger in her, confirming once again the truth that Ada's body revealed.

Investigators want to be sure about the evidence, be sure about what they have, and so they take these colposcope pictures I spoke about that Sharon Welch took, and they sent them independently to a nurse practitioner who's got a specialization in dealing with injuries and children of -- that have suffered physical and sexual abuse. And Jackie Hess is that nurse practitioner. And she looked at just the photos, knows nothing about this case but the photos, and independently says, This is a friction injury. This is

an abrasion. I think a finger or a penis would cause this.

Said, Well, wait a minute. What about barbed-wire? And she was asked by the detectives.

And she said, No, that's not that type of injury and there's no other injuries outside, confirming, again, the truth that Ada's body tells, that Ada herself had already told, that the Defendant was a poacher and she his prey, that he set it up so it would be her word against his, controlling everything so he could get away, not expecting the mark he left behind.

All these three doctors confirm what Ada had already told.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of this trial I'm going to ask you to find the Defendant is a poacher, to find that Ada was his prey, that he searched for the time, place, and manner where he could snatch her up. He did it so no one would know what he did, so he could get away.

And now he's going to ask you to ignore the truth that her body tells and to believe that she made it up or was convinced to make it up and try to explain that injury in a way that isn't supported by the facts or the science. And later, at the end of this trial, your verdict will decide which one it is.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Long.

Mr. Green, would you like to make an

opening statement at this time?

MR. GREEN: I would, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, sir.

DEFENDANT'S OPENING STATEMENT

MR. GREEN: I want to thank you again for being here and for taking this as seriously as you do.

This is an important trial. The evidence that the State talks about, some of it exists, some of it is questionable, and none of it is absolutely definitive of what happened in this case. You're going to have to decide based on what you hear whether or not the little girl is telling the truth and whether or not this actually happened.

The State is saying that Ada's statements are corroborated by physical evidence of an injury that's located at the lower end of the -- inside the vulva but -- inside the labia but under the vulva of her vagina. It's an abrasion, a friction injury, an injury that happens when two things rub together. The doctors are going to say that this is consistent with a finger or a fingernail, but it can also be consistent with so many other things that that evidence alone cannot

possibly convict my client.

My client was a hard worker. He worked on the ranch. He was at the ranch for approximately six months prior to this additional family joining the ranch. He worked for Paul, he did not work for Katie. When Katie and her family came to the ranch, she started working there, then eventually moved her family into that mobile home that the State showed you in the pictures.

And she lived there on the ranch with her two children. And her two children, while she was working, were playing -- would play around the ranch. They would run around, go see the animals, climb the fences, play on the -- there's a cattle trailer there for transporting cattle. They would play on that. There were all kinds of ways that a child could get injured on this ranch.

(The proceedings resumed with the presence of Sabine Michael, court interpreter.)

MR. GREEN: Now, there's blood in her underwear, the underwear that she was wearing on the day in question. The question is, did that come from an injury that was incurred by my client, or did that come from some other injury that had happened either earlier in the day or later in the day or whatever? There's no

evidence that ties the two together. It's all circumstantial. It matches in some ways; it doesn't match in other ways, and you are going to have to decide what those ways are.

It's the State's burden to prove that my client is guilty; it's not my client's duty to prove that he's not. The State's going to put on a lot of evidence. I'm going to put on very little evidence, and the reason for that is because it's the State's burden to prove this.

So all I can ask at this point is that you look carefully at the evidence. The statements made by Mr. Long are not evidence, nor are the statements that I'm making right now. The evidence will be presented to you by witnesses, by physical objects, and you'll have to determine based on that, not based on the statements that we make.

All I'm asking is that you give my client the constitutional right that he has to be presumed innocent until the State proves him guilty.

(Further proceedings were reported and previously transcribed.)

---000---

CERTIFICATE

I, Jacquelyn A. Allen, RPR, a Certified Reporter in the State of Arizona, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 - 21 constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

SIGNED and dated this 22nd day of April,

JACQUELYN A. ALLEN, RPR Certified Reporter No. 50151 For the State of Arizona

2014.